

C-C-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-I,

T/I/M-32 thur 39
23 March 1966UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION

TASK TEAM I - CONTENT CONTROL

Minutes of the Thirty-second thru Thirty-ninth meetings, 17 March 1966Members or Their Representatives Present

NSA

CIA

DIA

STATE

CSS

Others Present

None

1. During the period 13 October 1965 - 31 January 1966, the Team was in a report writing mode. During this period the Team prepared a proposed USIB Content Control Code encompassing an area notation, a subject-modifier notation, and a set of identifiers to indicate the presence of proper names of people, organizations, installations, etc., appearing in the text of reports. Seven meetings were held during this period. Because of the repetitious nature of the activities involved in designing the notation schemes and preparing an interim report to CODIB, the preparation and distribution of formal minutes of those meetings were suspended. These minutes represent a resumption of the preparation and distribution of formal team minutes.

2. The interim report with a proposed USIB Content Control Code was transmitted to CODIB members on 1 March 1966. Therein, the Team proposed an operational test of the code as the next step in carrying out its assignment, i.e., to develop a scheme for identifying the substantive content of intelligence items at or near the time of their publication and to determine the feasibility of its application throughout the Intelligence Community. This scheme should be designed primarily to facilitate the dissemination of intelligence items (CODIB-D-111/1.1/2).

C-C-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-I,

Group 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

- 2 -

3. Subsequent to the distribution of the interim report to CODIB members, team members developed plans for the operational test of the proposed USIB Content Control Code tailored to the character of their own agency operations, needs, etc. The purpose of this meeting was to exchange information on plans developed thus far, to identify similarities and differences in these plans, to discuss basic principles to be followed and, finally, to develop a list of questions to be answered by all of the various agency tests. 25X1

25X1
25X1
4. [] reported on plans for the CIA test developed by [] and himself. [] noted that subject/area content was by no means the only criterion for disseminating an intelligence document. He referred to paragraph II F 6., Findings, of the interim report which concludes that decisions to disseminate can be based on type of report, significance or urgency, source of information, security classifications, restrictions, and the "need to know" principle.

5. Discussion also occurred concerning whether the proposed code was designed primarily for primary dissemination, i.e., between agencies, or secondary dissemination, i.e., within agency. The Team noted that dissemination by subject/area occurs most frequently in secondary dissemination at present. Therefore, it is most appropriate that secondary dissemination be used to test the code. This fact, however, should not be construed as the intention to de-emphasize its potential for use in primary dissemination to reduce unnecessary interagency paper flow.

25X1
6. [] reported on plans being developed by [] and himself for the operational test of the code in DIA. A somewhat different approach from that taken in CIA was made necessary by the nature of DIA dissemination operations. These differences centered about the fact that the present DIA dissemination operation utilizes computers to match substance with requirement and to effect dissemination. Consequently, it is not separable on the same basis as the CIA operation. 25X1

7. Mr. Whipp discussed plans developed by Dr. Allen and himself for conducting the tests in State. A variation in procedure was also noted here which would require tailoring the tests. For secondary dissemination that is accomplished by INR in State, it was suggested that CIA and DIA reproduce copies of the items they have content controlled for use by INR rather than have INR personnel content control code a test corpus of other agencies' documents.

25X1
8. [] discussed plans for evaluating the proposed code in NSA. He listed a number of questions which he felt should be answered by all agencies testing the code (attachment). He also discussed some basic principles for conducting the test, i.e., coding redundancy, etc.

9. For the reasons mentioned above in connection with tailoring the tests to each agency environment, it was decided to confine consideration at

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

- 3 -

this meeting to the tests involving the application of the code in the various agencies and to withhold further discussion of the dissemination tests until the next meeting.

25X1 10. [] then scheduled the next meeting of the Task Team at 0930 hours, Wednesday, 30 March 1966 in Room 2E49, CIA Headquarters. He hoped that sufficient testing of code application could be accomplished between this meeting and the next so that team evaluation of coding application could be initiated. Plans for the dissemination tests could then be reviewed and modified, if necessary, in light of the results of the application tests and evaluations.

[]
Secretary

25X1

Attachment

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

ATTACHMENT

Areas which should be commented upon by testing agencies.

1. Coding corpus

- a. Number of items coded
- b. Source(s) of items coded, e.g., own or other agency, specify
- c. Nature of items coded, e.g., textual collection products, technical processing products, studies, estimates, projections, etc.
- d. Number of notations applied

(1) Maximum number on an individual item

(2) Average number on all items

NOTE: Retain all coded items for subsequent analysis.

2. Application considerations

a. Training for applications

(1) Type of instruction necessary to reach test-level proficiency

(2) Time needed to reach test-level proficiency

NOTE: Need definition of test-level proficiency from team members.

b. Application

(1) Time per item (average)

NOTE: Record only that part of the processing time attributable to the application of the code.

(2) Personnel

(a) Skill level utilized

(b) Skill level required (estimates)

(c) Amount of supervision required (after having reached test-level proficiency)

- 2 -

(d) Need for review after having reached test-level proficiency (range 100% - 0%)

c. Problem areas encountered in applying code to corpus

(1) Content, structure, or code notations

(2) Coding instructions

NOTE: Suggest changes or additions to alleviate problem areas identified.

d. Other appropriate comments by coders, evaluators, monitors, etc.